

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMIE TORRES,

Plaintiff,

v.

ULTA BEAUTY COSMETICS, LLC; and
DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:24-cv-11228-MEMF-AS

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE
COURT SHOULD NOT DECLINE TO
EXERCISE SUPPLEMENTAL
JURISDICTION OVER PLAINTIFF’S
STATE LAW CLAIMS**

On December 31, 2024, Jamie Torres filed a Complaint against Ulta Beauty Cosmetics, Inc. and Does 1-10, asserting: (1) a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*; and (2) a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), Cal. Civ. Code § 51, *et seq.* ECF No. 1. The Complaint alleges that this Court has jurisdiction over the ADA claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, and that the state law claims are brought “[p]ursuant to supplemental jurisdiction.” *Id.* at ¶¶ 7–8.

Principles of pendent jurisdiction have been codified in the supplemental jurisdiction statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1367. The supplemental jurisdiction statute “reflects the understanding that, when

1 deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, ‘a federal court should consider and weigh in
2 each case, and *at every stage of the litigation*, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness,
3 and comity.’” *City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997) (emphasis added)
4 (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)).

5 California law sets forth a heightened pleading standard for a limited group of lawsuits
6 brought under the Unruh Act. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 425.55(a)(2) & (3). The stricter pleading
7 standard requires certain plaintiffs bringing construction-access claims like the one in the instant
8 case to file a verified complaint alleging specific facts concerning the plaintiff’s claim, including the
9 specific barriers encountered or how the plaintiff was deterred and each date on which the plaintiff
10 encountered each barrier or was deterred. *See* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.50(a). A “high-frequency
11 litigant fee” is also imposed on certain plaintiffs and law firms bringing these claims. *See* Cal. Gov’t
12 Code § 70616.5. A “high-frequency litigant” is “a plaintiff who has filed 10 or more complaints
13 alleging a construction-related accessibility violation within the 12-month period immediately
14 preceding the filing of the current complaint alleging a construction-related accessibility violation”
15 *and* “an attorney who has represented as attorney of record 10 or more high-frequency litigant
16 plaintiffs in actions that were resolved within the 12-month period immediately preceding the filing
17 of the current complaint alleging a construction-related accessibility violation.” Cal. Civ. Proc. Code
18 §§ 425.55(b)(1) & (2). High frequency litigants are also required to state: (1) whether the complaint
19 is filed by, or on behalf of, a high-frequency litigant; (2) in the case of a high-frequency litigant who
20 is a plaintiff, the number of complaints alleging construction-related accessibility claim filed by the
21 high-frequency litigant during the 12 months prior to filing the instant complaint; (3) the reason the
22 individual was in the geographic area of the defendant’s business; and (4) the reason why the
23 individual desired to access the defendant’s business.” *See id.* § 425.50(a)(4)(A).

24 In light of the foregoing, the Court orders Torres to show cause in writing why the Court
25 should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). In
26 responding to this Order to Show Cause:

- 27 1. Torres shall identify the amount of statutory damages Torres seeks to recover.
28

1 2. Torres and Torres's counsel shall also support their responses to the Order to Show Cause
2 with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court
3 to determine if they satisfy the definition of a "high-frequency litigant" as provided by
4 California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 425.55(b)(1) & (2). This includes, but is not limited
5 to:

- 6 a. the number of construction-related accessibility claims filed by Torres in the twelve
7 months preceding the filing of the present claim; and
8 b. the number of construction-related accessibility claims in which Torres's counsel has
9 represented high-frequency litigant plaintiffs in the twelve months preceding the
10 filing of the present claim.

11 Torres shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause by no later than fourteen days from
12 the date of this order. The failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may,
13 without further warning, result in the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the
14 Unruh Act claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

15
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17
18
19 Dated: January 30, 2025



20 MAAME EWUSI-MENSAH FRIMPONG

21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28